# JAST (Journal of Animal Science and Technology) TITLE PAGE Upload this completed form to website with submission

ARTICLE INFORMATION	Fill in information in each box below
Article Type	Research
Article Title (within 20 words without abbreviations)	Age-related changes in growth and fecal parameters, nutrient digestibility, hematology, and serum biochemistry of Beagle dogs
Running Title (within 10 words)	Age-specific comparative evaluation of growth and health in Beagles
Author	Yonggu Kang1#, Younghoon Kim2#, Jin Ho Cho3#, Hyeun Bum Kim4#, Kimoon Kim1, Jinmu Ahn1, Ikcheol Shin1, Min Kyu Kim1, Minho Song1*, Hyunjin Kyoung1*
Affiliation	1 Department of Animal Science and Biotechnology, Chungnam National University, Daejeon 34134, South Korea 2 Department of Agricultural Biotechnology and Research Institute of Agriculture and Life Science, Seoul National University, Seoul 08826, South Korea 3 Department of Animal Science, Chungbuk National University, Cheongju 28644, South Korea 4 Department of Animal Biotechnology, Dankook University, Cheonan 31116, South Korea
ORCID (for more information, please visit https://orcid.org)	Yonggu Kang (https://orcid.org/0009-0008-3593-2656) Younghoon Kim (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6769-0657) Jin Ho Cho (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7151-0778) Hyeun Bum Kim (https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1366-6090) Kimoon Kim (https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2988-5179) Jinmu Ahn (https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1490-2974) Ikcheol Shin (https://orcid.org/0009-0003-0072-5626) Min Kyu Kim (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9259-8219) Minho Song (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4515-5212) Hyunjin Kyoung (https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5742-5374)
Competing interests	No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.
Funding sources State funding sources (grants, funding sources, equipment, and supplies). Include name and number of grant if available.	This study was supported by the Cooperative Research Program for Agriculture Science and Technology Development (RS-2023-00230754; RS-2024-00398491), Rural Development Administration, Republic of Korea.
Acknowledgements	Not applicable.
Availability of data and material	Upon reasonable request, the datasets of this study can be available from the corresponding author.
Authors' contributions Please specify the authors' role using this form.	Conceptualization: Kang Y, Kim Y, Cho JH, Kim HB, Kim MK, Song M, Kyoung H. Data curation: Kang Y, Song M, Kyoung H. Formal analysis: Kang Y, Kim K, Ahn J, Shin I. Methodology: Kang Y, Kim MK, Song M, Kyoung H. Software: Kang Y, Kim K, Ahn J, Shin I. Validation: Kim Y, Cho JH, Kim HB, Kim MK, Song M, Kyoung H. Investigation: Kang Y, Kim K. Writing - original draft: Kang Y, Kim Y, Cho JH, Kim HB. Writing - review & editing: Kang Y, Kim Y, Cho JH, Kim HB, Kim K, Ahn J, Shin I, Kim MK, Song M, Kyoung H.
Ethics approval and consent to participate	The protocol for this study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of Chungnam National University, Daejeon, South Korea (approval #: 202310A-CNU-179).

## 5 CORRESPONDING AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

For the corresponding author (responsible for correspondence, proofreading, and reprints)	Fill in information in each box below			
First name, middle initial, last name	Minho Song Hyunjin Kyoung			
Email address – this is where your proofs will be sent	mhsong@cnu.ac.kr hjkyoung@cnu.ac.kr			
Secondary Email address				
Address	Department of Animal Science and Biotechnology, Chungnam National University, Daejeon 34134, South Korea Department of Animal Science and Biotechnology, Chungnam National University, Daejeon 34134, South Korea			
Cell phone number				
Office phone number	+82-42-821-5776 +82-42-821-7857			
Fax number				



# Abstract

The objective of this study was to evaluate the effects of age on growth and fecal parameters,
nutrient digestibility, hematology, and serum biochemistry of Beagle dogs. A total of 18 healthy Beagles
were allotted into three groups according to age (puppy, under 1 year old; adult, 1-7 years old; senior, over
7 years old). The study lasted for 17 days, with a 7-day adaptation period and 10-day evaluation period.
During the evaluation period, individual body weight, length, and food intake were estimated and recorded
to calculate growth parameters. Fecal samples were collected from all beagles to evaluate fecal score and
nutrient digestibility by visual observation and chemical analyses, respectively. Blood samples were
collected from each dog to evaluate hematological and biochemical parameters using automated
hematology analyzer and clinical autoanalyzer, respectively. Puppy group had increased ( $p < 0.05$ ) body
weight change during the study compared with adult or senior groups. At the end of the food trial, body
condition score of all age groups were ideal. Puppies had higher ( $p < 0.05$ ) fecal moisture content and
diarrhea frequency than adult or senior dogs. Senior group had lower ( $p < 0.05$ ) apparent total tract
digestibility (ATTD) of crude protein than puppy or adult groups. Puppy group had lower ( $p < 0.05$ ) ATTD
of ether extract, crude fiber, and nitrogen-free extract than adult or senior groups. Puppies had higher
number of white blood cells and neutrophils at the initial $(p < 0.05)$ and final $(p = 0.062)$ day of the
evaluation period than senior dogs. Senior dogs had lower ( $p < 0.05$ ) levels of serum albumin, glucose, and
creatinine during the evaluation than puppies. Puppy group had higher ( $p < 0.05$ ) serum alkaline phosphate
level at the initial and final day of the evaluation than adult or senior groups. In conclusion, our study
determined the effect of age on growth and fecal parameters, nutrient digestibility, hematology, and serum
biochemistry of Beagle dogs.

Keywords: Apparent total tract digestibility, Beagles, Biochemical parameters, Complete blood count

Companion animals are considered family members who share our lives. Changes in population structure, socioeconomic development, and cultural changes have led to an increase in companion animal ownership worldwide, leading to greater interest in their health and well-being [1–4]. People are increasingly concerned about the quality of the foods for their companion animals, including protein sources, and are investing generously in high-quality and functional products to promote animal health [4,5]. In addition, as the lifespan of companion dogs has increased due to improved veterinary care and quality of canine foods, it is important to understand the physiological changes for nutritional management throughout their life cycle [6,7]. As a result, academic efforts to optimize nutrient utilization and promote health throughout the lifespan of dogs are becoming increasingly important. For this purpose, several organizations such as the National Research Council (NRC), the Association of American Feed Control Officials (AAFCO), and the European Pet Food Industry Federation (FEDIAF) have presented recommendations for nutrient profiles for dogs [8–10]. However, these standards may have limitations in reflecting the diversity of all breeds and ages, and the results of previous studies on nutrient utilization and health are diverse. Thus, it is necessary to investigate age-related physiological changes through various studies.

Nutritional physiology of companion dogs undergoes dynamic changes throughout their life stages. In particular, during the growth period, high nutrient requirements are needed due to tissue development, skeletal formation, and immune system maturation [11–14]. On the other hand, during the aging period, appropriate nutritional management is essential for maintaining health due to decreased digestive efficiency, altered gut microbiota, and reduced immune functions [13,15,16]. Thus, aging is a key variable that influences the digestive function, nutrient metabolism, immune responses, and tissue functions. Previous studies on improving the health of companion dogs have evaluated various indicators such as nutrient digestibility, hematological and biochemical parameters, and gut microbial changes, however these studies focused on one or two age groups [7,17,18]. Therefore, research on a comprehensive approach is needed to characterize physiological changes by age. The present study hypothesized that there would be changes in

growth and fecal characteristics, nutrient digestibility, and hematological and biochemical indices of dogs with age, even when fed same canine foods. Physiological differences are an essential consideration for food formulation and age-specific health management. Therefore, this study aimed to evaluate growth and fecal parameters, nutrient digestibility, hematology, and serum biochemistry of three life stages of Beagle dogs fed the same diet.

## **Materials and Methods**

#### **Animal ethics**

The protocol for this study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of Chungnam National University, Daejeon, South Korea (approval #: 202310A-CNU-179).

#### Experimental design, animals, and diet

Eighteen clinically healthy Beagle dogs were divided into three age groups: puppies (n = 6; under 1 year old; average age of  $48.2 \pm 11.3$  weeks; mean body weight [BW] =  $6.21 \pm 0.61$  kg; 2 neutered males and 4 neutered females), adults (n = 6; 1–7 years old; average age of  $4.5 \pm 2.1$  years; mean BW =  $8.16 \pm 0.70$  kg; 3 neutered males and 3 neutered females), and senior dogs (n = 6; older than 7 years; average age of  $9.5 \pm 0.8$  years; mean BW =  $6.95 \pm 1.52$  kg; 3 neutered males and 3 neutered females). Dogs were individually housed in stainless steel cage ( $0.9 \times 0.9 \times 1.0$  m) with automatically controlled temperature throughout the study (diet adaptation from days -7 to 0; data and sample collection from days 1 to 10). The experimental diet was formulated using hydrolyzed chicken powder, brown rice, and soy protein to meet nutrient profiles for growth and reproduction minimum (crude protein and indispensable amino acids) or adult maintenance minimum (crude fat, calcium [Ca], phosphorus [P], and Ca to P ratio) provided by the Association of American Feed Control Officials (AAFCO) and manufactured in extruded form (Table 1 and 2) [19]. The dog food was provided by calculating maintenance energy requirements (MER) for each dog (puppy,  $132 \times BW^{0.75}$ ; adult,  $132 \times BW^{0.75}$ ; senior,  $105 \times BW^{0.75}$ ) based on standard equations [20]. All dogs were fed twice daily (09:00 and 17:00).

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

#### Data and sample collection

After the food adaptation period, individual dog BW and body condition score (BCS) were weighed and estimated at the beginning and end of the data and sample collection period and food intake was recorded each day. Body weight change (BWC) and daily food intake (DFI) were calculated for growth parameters of Beagle dogs. The BCS of each dog was measured using a frame marked with the length of chest and abdomen, and the ratio was calculated to evaluate fatness related to health conditions [21]. The BCS scale ranged from 1 to 9 (under BW to over BW), with an ideal score of 4 to 5, according to the American Animal Hospital Association [22]. Blood samples were collected from each dog using 5 mL tubes (BD Vacutainer Systems, Franklin Lakes, NJ, USA) with or without ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA) via leg vein on day 1 and 10 after a 12 h fasting period [23]. The collected blood samples in non-EDTA tubes were centrifuged at 3,000 rpm for 15 minutes at 4 °C to obtain serum samples and stored at -80 °C for biochemical analysis [24]. Fecal samples were collected at least twice daily from days 2 to 9 before feeding to evaluate the fecal score and nutrient digestibility using visual observations and total collection method, respectively [25,26]. The fecal score was recorded from 1 to 5 (hard dry to watery diarrhea) with half numerical increments by two independent visual evaluators [27]. The frequency of diarrhea or hard dry feces was calculated by counting cage days with a pen fecal score  $\geq 3.5$  or < 2.0, respectively. During total fecal collection, feces were collected, weighed, and stored at -80 °C with diet until nutrient digestibility analyses.

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

#### **Nutrient digestibility analyses**

Frozen diet and fecal samples were thawed at room temperature, dried in a forced-air oven (FC-PO-91, LabHouse, Pocheon-si, Gyeonggi-do, South Korea) at 65 °C for 72 hours, and ground using a coffee grinder (Electric Coffee Grinder, Hamilton Beach, USA) for chemical analyses [28]. The ground samples were analyzed for dry matter, energy using a bomb calorimeter (C2000, IKA Works Inc., Staufen, Germany), and crude protein using Kjeldahl method (VAPOXX, Gerhardt Ltd., IdarOberstein, Germany), ether extract, crude fiber, crude ash, nitrogen-free extract (NFE), calcium, and phosphorus according to the

Association of Official Analytical Chemists methods [29]. Amino acids contents were analyzed using high-performance liquid chromatography (Waters Alliance System with a Waters 1525 Binary HPLC Pump, Waters 2707 Autosampler, and Waters 2475 Multi  $\lambda$  Fluorescence Detector, Milford, USA) [30]. The analyzed chemical compositions were calculated to determine apparent total tract digestibility (ATTD) according to a previous report [31].

#### Hematological and biochemical analyses

The blood samples collected in tubes containing EDTA were analyzed for complete blood count (CBC) using an automated hematology analyzer (Mindray BC-5000 auto hematology analyzer, Mindray Medical France Sarl, HyTest Ltd, China). The CBC test included fifteen parameters: number of white blood cells (WBC) and their differentiation counts and proportions (neutrophil, lymphocyte, monocyte, and eosinophil) and red blood cell profile (hematocrit, mean cell volume [MCV], mean cell hemoglobin [MCH], mean corpuscular hemoglobin concentration [MCHC], red cell distribution width-coefficient of variation [RDW-CV], red cell distribution width-standard deviation [RDW-SD], platelet, and mean platelet volume [MPV]). Serum samples were analyzed for biochemical parameters using a clinical autoanalyzer (Roche Cobas c 111 chemistry analyzer, Roche Diagnostics Ltd, USA). The serum biochemical test included eleven parameters: aspartate aminotransferase, alanine aminotransferase, alkaline phosphatase (ALP), creatinine, calcium, albumin, glucose, total protein, triglyceride, total cholesterol, and blood urea nitrogen.

#### Statistical analyses

Data were analyzed using the GLM procedure of SAS software (v. 9.4; SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) in a completely randomized design. Experimental unit was the Beagle dog. Differences in means among treatments were determined using Tukey's multiple range test. Diarrhea and hard dry feces frequency were analyzed using the Chi-square test of SAS. Differences were considered significant at p < 0.05 and tendency at p < 0.10.

136 Results

#### **Growth and fecal parameters**

Puppies had increased (p < 0.05) BWC during the overall experiment compared with adults or senior beagles (Table 3). The DFI values (as-is, DM basis, calorie basis) were highest (p < 0.05) in puppies, followed by adults and senior dogs. In addition, daily fecal output (DFO) values (as-is and DM basis) were highest (p < 0.05) in the puppy group, followed by the adult and senior groups. Puppies were higher (p < 0.05) calorie-based DFO than adult or senior dogs. However, there was no difference on calorie-based DFO between the adult and senior groups. In fecal characteristics, the puppy group had higher (p < 0.05) fecal moisture content than the senior group. Additionally, puppies had higher (p < 0.05) diarrhea ratio than adult or senior dogs. However, there were no difference on fecal score and hard dry feces frequency among the age groups.

#### **Nutrient digestibility**

The ATTD using the total collection method among age groups are shown in Table 4 and 5. Senior dogs had lower (p < 0.05) ATTD of crude protein than the puppies or adults (Table 4). In addition, senior dogs tended to have lower (p = 0.082) crude ash digestibility than puppies. The puppy group had lower (p < 0.05) ATTD of ether extract, crude fiber, NFE, and phosphorus than the adult or senior groups. The ATTD of calcium was highest (p < 0.05) in senior dogs, followed by adult dogs and puppies. However, there were no differences on the ATTD of indispensable and dispensable amino acids among age groups (Table 5).

#### Hematological and biochemical profiles

The hematological and biochemical profiles are shown in Table 6 and 7, respectively. At the beginning of the food trial, the puppy group had higher (p < 0.05) number of WBC than the adult or senior groups (Table 6). In addition, the puppies had higher (p < 0.05) number of neutrophils and monocytes than the adult or senior dogs. The MCHC level had highest in the adult group followed by the puppy group and the senior group (p < 0.05). On the last day of the study, puppies have tended to higher WBC (p = 0.062) and neutrophil (p = 0.096) counts than senior dogs. Additionally, the puppy group had higher (p < 0.05)

lymphocyte counts on day 10 than the adult group. The neutrophil proportion was higher (p < 0.05) on day 10 in adult dogs than in senior dogs. In the red blood cell profile, the puppy group had higher (p < 0.05) MCV level on day 10 than the adult or senior groups. The MCH level showed a higher (p < 0.05) in puppies than senior dogs. The adult group tended to have a higher (p = 0.080) MCHC level than the senior group. The RDW-CV and RDW-SD values were higher (p < 0.05) in senior dogs than adult dogs. The puppy group had lower (p < 0.05) MPV level on day 10 than the adult or senior groups.

In the serum biochemistry at the start of the study, adult dogs had lower (p < 0.05) albumin, glucose, and creatinine levels than puppies or senior dogs (Table 7). A trend was observed in serum triglyceride level (p = 0.085), with the senior group have tended to higher than the puppy group. Adult dogs tended to have a higher (p = 0.072) the BUN level than puppies. The puppy group had a higher (p < 0.05) level of ALP in serum than the adult or senior groups. On the last day of the food trial, senior dogs had lower (p < 0.05) serum albumin, glucose, and creatinine levels than puppies or adult dogs. However, levels of serum BUN, calcium, and ALP were higher (p < 0.05) in the puppy group than the adult or senior groups.

# Discussion

Our study demonstrated that Beagles fed the same diet showed age-related differences in growth and fecal parameters, nutrient digestibility, hematology, and serum biochemistry. These findings reflect physiological and metabolic differences in nutrient utilization according to age and suggest the need for age-related feeding programs in canine food design. During the pre-adult period (< 1 year of age; post-weaning and growing period), MER is high due to high nutritional metabolic demands for growth and body tissue synthesis [20]. On the other hand, during adult and senior periods, food intake is relatively low compared to puppies because it is recommended to meet the MER for maintenance metabolism. Accordingly, the food supply amount in our study was set based on the NRC, and DFI differed among the age groups based on the as-is, DM basis, and calorie basis. In addition, puppies showed the highest BWC, indicating that energy utilization through dog food was effective during the period when energy for growth was required, as mentioned above. Adult and senior dogs with low BWC would have relatively low energy

utilization due to a lower food supply compared with puppies, as their nutritional metabolism is focused on maintenance. In particular, the decreased BWC of the senior group indicates that the efficiency of energy metabolism may decrease with age. However, the BCS was remained within the ideal range (score of 4–5) [22] in all age groups at the end of the study suggests that the feeding amount of experimental canine food was appropriately adjusted to the NRC-based recommendations.

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

In fecal parameters, the DFO based on the as-is and DM basis followed the order of the puppy, adult, and senior groups can be seen as the result of "high input, high output" in proportion to the amount of food supply and intake, but there may be differences in energy utilization efficiency among age groups. This is because the DFO based on the as-is and DM basis in the senior group was lower than in the adult group, but there was no difference in calorie-based DFO between the two groups. The fecal moisture content and frequency of diarrhea were higher in puppies. The high diarrhea rate in puppies may be due to underdeveloped gut health, such as an immature digestive system and/or an imbalance in the gut microbial environment at this phase, or may be due to a short gut transit time following high intake. Previous studies have reported that controlling the crude protein content in the feed of weaned piglets can prevent diarrhea caused by protein fermentation [32,33]. In this study, the canine food followed the minimum amount of crude protein for growth and reproduction, including amino acids, and the minimum amount of crude fat, calcium, and phosphorus for adult maintenance. Although the experimental food contained a high level of crude protein compared with the minimum level, which may be associated with diarrhea in puppies with an immature gut system, the growth parameters confirmed that the diet supported a high MER during this period. These findings emphasize the need to provide an appropriate nutritional profile considering age of dogs.

Nutrient digestibility is a dynamic physiological response influenced by the utilization of nutrients from food, and the overall health and wellness of companion dogs, and varies according to the age of dogs. From birth to the adult period, the secretion and activity of digestive enzymes develop rapidly [34]. In addition, nutrient digestibility increased with age, but also differed with breed size [35]. Previous studies have reported that nutrient digestibility was stable or even higher rather than decreasing with age [7,13,36,37]. In addition to age, factors that influence nutrient digestibility of dogs include nutrient

composition (dietary fiber, starch, and bioactive substances) and ingredients (plant and meat) of the food and the technical manufacturing process (heating, cooking, extrusion, and particle size) [38,39]. For instance, the ATTD of dry matter and main nutrients (crude protein, ether extract, starch, and carbohydrates) in cooked food, including meat (lamb meal, poultry meal, or fish meal) and plant ingredients (wheat and corn-based) is 79–99% [40]. On the other hand, uncooked, unextruded, or overheated ingredients can reduce nutrient digestibility of dogs, especially protein and amino acids [2,41]. Pet food regulatory agencies, including AAFCO and FEDIAF, base minimum nutrient requirements on assumed digestibility of at least 70% for dry matter and 80% for protein [42]. Additionally, canine nutritionists generally consider 80% to be an appropriate minimum target for digestibility, with 80-90% being the ideal value for nutrients [42]. In this study, the ATTD of dry matter, organic matter, and energy was 88.95–89.76%, 95.27–96.10%, and 92.68–93.51%, respectively, confirming the appropriate basic digestibility among age groups.

We determined differences on digestibility of other nutrients by age groups. The minimum recommendation for crude protein is higher during the growth and reproductive stages than during the maintenance period in adults [19]. These differences reflect fundamental biological differences between life stages and are supported by the results of the ATTD of crude protein. Additionally, the decreased ATTD of crude protein in the senior group is considered to be due to complex factors such as reduced gut functions and digestive enzyme secretion and activity following aging. On the other hand, it has been reported that the activities of pepsin, trypsin, and chymotrypsin, which are involved in protein digestion, develop rapidly during puppies and stabilize in adult dogs [34]. In addition, no difference on the digestibility of crude protein was confirmed between weanling dogs or adult dogs and senior dogs [7,17,36]. However, the decrease in the number of proliferative cells in the intestinal epithelium with age implies a decrease in cellular turnover and may lead to a low adaptability to changes in the digestive environment [43]. Additionally, increased fiber fermentation by gut microbiota can increase microbial nitrogen excretion, which may decrease the ATTD of crude protein [36,44].

In this study, the ATTD of crude fiber was lower in puppies than in adult or senior dogs. Since fiber digestion occurs primarily through microbial fermentation in the large intestine, the difference may be related to the development of the gut microbial ecosystem. Microbial diversity is a complex interaction involving genetics, breed, birth type, and diet, which collectively compose the microbial community [15]. While previous studies have shown inconsistent results in age-related changes on microbial diversity [45–47], it is generally accepted that the composition of gut microbiota undergoes rapid restructuring during early life and reaches a relatively stable state by one year of age [46,48]. Thus, this microbial development in adult and senior dogs may contribute to more efficient fermentation and subsequent short-chain fatty acids (SCFA) production from dietary fiber. Furthermore, the similar ATTD of crude fiber between adult and senior groups suggests that fiber digestibility is well maintained with age. This may be due to the low non-starch polysaccharides and anti-nutritional factor contents of brown rice, which was used as the main source in the experimental diet [49] and is supported by the results of improved digestibility reported in a previous study [50,51].

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

The ATTD of ether extract and NFE was lower in puppies than in adult or senior beagles. These results suggest that immaturity of digestive enzyme function in early life may contribute to reduced nutrient utilization, which is consistent with previous findings indicating that digestibility values stabilize or increase with age [7,13,36,37]. In addition, although the results of calorie-based DFO predicted a difference in energy utilization between adult and senior dogs, the digestibility of energy-related nutrients did not differ between the two groups. This suggests that there may be no difference in energy utilization for maintenance between adult and senior dogs under normal physiological conditions. Compared with the ATTD of crude ash, the ATTD of calcium and phosphorus showed opposite results with age. This suggests that the metabolic utilization of minerals may differ across the life cycle of beagles. Ash is a broad indicator of minerals and may indicate increased utilization with growth and development. On the other hand, the improved or maintained ATTD of calcium and phosphorus with age may be related to morphological and functional changes in the intestine of dogs [43,52]. In addition, it can be assumed that passive utilization is enhanced due to an increase in mineral solubility by changing gut pH through the production of SCFA following dietary fiber fermentation in the gut. Furthermore, since the calcium content in the food affects the digestibility of phosphorus [53] formulation of food reflecting nutritional metabolic characteristics should be considered. The ATTD of amino acids did not differ between age groups, which may have induced changes in the amino acid profile due to contributions from the gut microbiota [38]. Therefore, the

evaluation of apparent ileal digestibility is also considered to evaluate the bioavailability of amino acids [2,54]. Collectively, our nutrient digestibility results revealed differences by age, suggesting the need for appropriate nutrient supply through diet composition according to developmental stage.

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

The CBC and serum biochemical profiling can objectively and specifically evaluate physiological status, and screening or monitoring through the test is important in health management [55]. WBC play an important role in response to inflammation, disease, and infection, and changes in their numbers indicate health status. In this study, age-related differences were observed in the numbers of WBC, including neutrophil, lymphocyte, and monocyte, suggesting dynamic changes in the immune system across life stages. The results of WBC differentiation by age are similar to those of previous studies [16,18,56], indicating changes in immunosenescence characteristics due to aging. It is possible that aging was accompanied by inflammaging, a state of low-grade, chronic, and systemic inflammation [6,18]. In addition, changes in WBC indices in senior beagles suggest a possible disruption of immune balance, which may also be related to decreased oxidative stress response ability and susceptibility to infection. These immunological changes are important considerations when developing health management and nutritional intervention strategies for older dogs. In red blood cell indices, MCHC level was higher or trended higher in adult beagles than in puppies or senior beagles during the study. On the other hand, MCV and MCH were higher in the puppy group than in the adult or senior groups, but RDW and MPV were higher in the senior group than in the puppy or adult groups. These results suggest an increase in erythrocyte heterogeneity due to age-related development of immature red blood cells combined with the effects of inflammation or iron deficiency [16,57]. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the physiological changes related to bone marrow production and hematopoiesis by life cycle of dogs and provide appropriate nutritional management, especially in senior dogs, as they can lead to chronic inflammation or signs of malnutrition.

In serum biochemistry, we observed age-related differences were observed in indicators reflecting nutritional metabolism and tissue functions. Throughout the study, senior beagles consistently exhibited lower concentrations of albumin, glucose, and creatinine in serum than puppies and adult beagles. On the other hand, puppies had higher serum ALP level than adult and senior beagles. These findings suggest changes in systemic metabolism associated with aging, involving the liver, kidney, and skeletal muscle

functions. The decline in serum albumin level with age may be due to reduced hepatic synthetic capacity as well as renal and/or intestinal losses, as previously reported in aging dogs [58,59]. In addition, the decrease in serum glucose level has been reported to be due to decreased hepatic glycogen storage function or decreased functional liver mass [16,60]. Serum creatinine level may indicate changes in muscle mass or renal function [61,62]. In addition, creatinine, a byproduct of muscle metabolism, may be present at lower concentrations in young animals due to lower muscle mass [7]. In contrast, a previous study revealed a positive correlation between serum creatinine and lean body mass [63]. It has been reported that an increase in serum ALP level is an enzyme associated with the physiological response to bone growth, and that levels were high during the bone growth period and decreased with age [7,62]. In this regard, puppies also have higher serum calcium levels, reflecting active regulation of calcium metabolism during the growth process. At the end of the experiment, puppies showed higher level of BUN than adult or senior dogs. Because BUN is a product of protein metabolism, including hepatic urea cycle and renal excretion [64], elevated level in puppies may reflect higher dietary protein intake in puppies than adult or old dogs. Taken together, these results suggest changes in basal metabolic rate and nutritional metabolic functions with aging, and differences in food intake should also be considered.

## 314 Conclusion

Our findings highlight the importance of considering age as a major factor influencing nutritional requirements, digestive efficiency, and systemic health physiology in Beagle dogs. Overall, optimal nutritional feeding is required during the growth period to support development with high nutrient availability, and with advancing age to address changes in digestive capacity, nutrient metabolism, and systemic health. In addition, this study suggests the need for age-specific food formulations and health screening or monitoring strategies to optimize the health maintenance of dogs throughout their lifespan. Collectively, the current study is expected to contribute to the development of age-specific dietary strategies and long-term health management of companion dogs.

Funding

This study was supported by the Cooperative Research Program for Agriculture Science and Technology

Development (RS-2023-00230754; RS-2024-00398491), Rural Development Administration, South Korea.



328 **References** 

- 329 1. Lee HS, Kim JH, Oh HJ, Kim JH. Effects of interval exercise training on serum biochemistry
- and bone mineral density in dogs. Animals. 2021;11:2528. https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11092528
- 2. Li P, Wu G. Amino acid nutrition and metabolism in domestic cats and dogs. J Anim Sci
- Biotechnol. 2023;14:19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40104-022-00827-8
- 333 3. Applebaum JW, Peek CW, Zsembik BA. Examining U.S. pet ownership using the General
- 334 Social Survey. Soc Sci J. 2023;60:110–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/03623319.2020.1728507
- 4. Valdés F, Villanueva V, Durán E, Campos F, Avendaño C, Sánchez M, et al. Insects as feed for
- 336 companion and exotic pets: A current trend. Animals. 2022;12:1450.
- 337 https://doi.org/10.3390/ani12111450
- 5. Di Donfrancesco B, Koppel K, Swaney-Stueve M, Chambers IV E. Consumer acceptance of
- dry dog food variations. Animals. 2014;4:313–30. https://doi.org/10.3390/ani4020313
- 6. Alexander JE, Colyer A, Haydock RM, Hayek MG, Park J. Understanding how dogs age:
- Longitudinal analysis of markers of inflammation, immune function, and oxidative stress. J
- 342 Gerontol Ser A. 2018;73:720–8. https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glx182
- 343 7. Swanson KS, Kuzmuk KN, Schook LB, Fahey GC. Diet affects nutrient digestibility,
- hematology, and serum chemistry of senior and weanling dogs. J Anim Sci. 2004;82:1713–24.
- 345 https://doi.org/10.2527/2004.8261713x
- 8. Fahey GC, Campion M, Collings GF, Donadelli R, Lambrakis L, Panasevich MR, et al. The art
- of establishing mineral tolerances of dogs and cats. J Anim Sci. 2024;102:skae132.
- 348 https://doi.org/10.1093/jas/skae132
- 9. Seo K, Cho HW, Lee MY, Kim CH, Kim KH, Chun JL. Prediction of apparent total tract
- digestion of crude protein in adult dogs. J Anim Sci Technol. 2024;66:374–86.
- 351 https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2024.e20
- 352 10. Kim KH, Seo K, Cho HW, Jeon JH, Kim CH, Jung J, et al. Age-related digestibility of nutrients
- depending on the moisture content in aged dogs. J Anim Sci Technol. 2021;63:1355–61.
- 354 https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2021.e116
- 355 11. Kiefer-Hecker B, Kienzle E, Dobenecker B. Effects of low phosphorus supply on the
- availability of calcium and phosphorus, and musculoskeletal development of growing dogs of
- 357 two different breeds. J Anim Physiol Anim Nutr. 2018;102:789–98.
- 358 https://doi.org/10.1111/jpn.12868

- 359 12. Guard BC, Mila H, Steiner JM, Mariani C, Suchodolski JS, Chastant-Maillard S.
- Characterization of the fecal microbiome during neonatal and early pediatric development in
- puppies. PLoS One. 2017;12:e0175718. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175718
- 362 13. Fahey GC, Barry KA, Swanson KS. Age-related changes in nutrient utilization by companion
- 363 animals. Annu Rev Nutr. 2008;28:425–45.
- 364 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.nutr.28.061807.155325
- 365 14. Buddington RK, Malo C. Postnatal development of nutrient transport in the intestine of dogs.
- 366 Am J Vet Res. 2003;64:635–45. https://doi.org/10.2460/ajvr.2003.64.635
- 367 15. Garrigues Q, Apper E, Chastant S, Mila H. Gut microbiota development in the growing dog:
- A dynamic process influenced by maternal, environmental and host factors. Front Vet Sci.
- 369 2022;9:964649. https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2022.964649
- 370 16. Radakovich LB, Pannone SC, Truelove MP, Olver CS, Santangelo KS. Hematology and
- biochemistry of aging—evidence of "anemia of the elderly" in old dogs. Vet Clin Pathol.
- 372 2017;46:34–45. https://doi.org/10.1111/vcp.12459
- 17. Gomes M de OS, Beraldo MC, Putarov TC, Brunetto MA, Zaine L, Glória MBA, et al. Old
- beagle dogs have lower faecal concentrations of some fermentation products and lower
- peripheral lymphocyte counts than young adult beagles. Br J Nutr. 2011;106:S187–90.
- 376 https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114511002960
- 377 18. Blanchard T, Mugnier A, Boulet F, Meynadier A, Priymenko N. Epidemiological and clinical
- profiles of young and senior dogs fed a standard diet. Prev Vet Med. 2025;240:106537.
- 379 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2025.106537
- 380 19. AAFCO. Official Publication. Assoc. Am. Feed Control Offic., Inc., Oxford, IN. 2003.
- 381 20. NRC. Nutrient Requirements of Dogs and Cats. Washington, DC: National Academies. 2006.
- 382 21. Chun JL, Bang HT, Ji SY, Jeong JY, Kim M, Kim B, et al. A simple method to evaluate body
- condition score to maintain the optimal body weight in dogs. J Anim Sci Technol. 2019;61:366–
- 384 70. https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2019.61.6.366
- 385 22. Brooks D, Churchill J, Fein K, Linder D, Michel KE, Tudor K, et al. 2014 AAHA weight
- management guidelines for dogs and cats. J Am Anim Hosp Assoc. 2014;50:1-11.
- 387 https://doi.org/10.5326/JAAHA-MS-6331
- 388 23. Kil T, Kim M. Effects of different processed forms of Panax ginseng on sperm motility and
- reproductive parameters in male dogs. J Anim Sci Technol. 2025;67:701–13.
- 390 https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2025.e35

- 391 24. Kyoung H, Kang Y, Ahn J, Cho JH, Seo D, Nam J, et al. Evaluation of dietary selenium sources
- and levels on growth performance, carcass characteristics, selenium concentrations, and blood
- 393 biochemistry of growing-finishing pigs. J Anim Sci Technol. 2025;67:607–18.
- 394 https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2024.e53
- 395 25. Nam J, Kim JN, Kim HB, Cho JH, Kim Y, Ahn J, et al. Effects of dietary aluminosilicate on
- growth performance, frequency of diarrhea, and blood profiles of weaned pigs. J Anim Sci
- 397 Technol. 2025;67:375–82. https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2024.e21
- 398 26. Park S, Choe J, Cho JH, Jang KB, Kyoung H, Park K II, et al. Determination of optimal energy
- 399 system and level for growing pigs. J Anim Sci Technol. 2024;66:514–22.
- 400 https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2023.e63
- 401 27. Seo K, Cho HW, Chun J, Jeon J, Kim C, Kim M, et al. Evaluation of fermented oat and black
- soldier fly larva as food ingredients in senior dog diets. Animals. 2021;11:3509.
- 403 https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11123509
- 404 28. Shin I, Kang Y, Ahn J, Kim Y, Nam J, Kim K, et al. The potential probiotic role of
- Lacticaseibacillus rhamnosus on growth performance, gut health, and immune responses of
- 406 weaned pigs. J Anim Sci. 2025;103:skaf089. https://doi.org/10.1093/jas/skaf089
- 407 29. AOAC. Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International. 18th ed Gaithersburg, MD:
- 408 AOAC International. 2006.
- 409 30. Jeon K, Lee J, Song M, Kim K, Jo M, Chang S, et al. Evaluation of the nutrient digestibility at
- each age in dogs diet by in vitro and in vivo methods. J Anim Sci Technol. 2024;66:1273–81.
- 411 https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2024.e69
- 412 31. Donadelli RA, Aldrich CG. The effects on nutrient utilization and stool quality of Beagle dogs
- fed diets with beet pulp, cellulose, and Miscanthus grass. J Anim Sci. 2019;97:4134–9.
- 414 https://doi.org/10.1093/jas/skz265
- 415 32. Heo JM, Kim JC, Hansen CF, Mullan BP, Hampson DJ, Pluske JR. Effects of feeding low
- protein diets to piglets on plasma urea nitrogen, faecal ammonia nitrogen, the incidence of
- diarrhoea and performance after weaning. Arch Anim Nutr. 2008;62:343–58.
- 418 https://doi.org/10.1080/17450390802327811
- 419 33. Heo JM, Opapeju FO, Pluske JR, Kim JC, Hampson DJ, Nyachoti CM. Gastrointestinal health
- and function in weaned pigs: a review of feeding strategies to control post-weaning diarrhoea
- without using in-feed antimicrobial compounds. J Anim Physiol Anim Nutr. 2013;97:207–37.
- 422 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0396.2012.01284.x

- 423 34. Buddington RK, Elnif J, Malo C, Donahoo JB. Activities of gastric, pancreatic, and intestinal
- brush-border membrane enzymes during postnatal development of dogs. Am J Vet Res.
- 425 2003;64:627–34. https://doi.org/10.2460/ajvr.2003.64.627
- 426 35. Weber M, Martin L, Biourge V, Nguyen P, Dumon H. Influence of age and body size on the
- digestibility of a dry expanded diet in dogs. J Anim Physiol Anim Nutr. 2003;87:21–31.
- 428 https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1439-0396.2003.00410.x
- 429 36. Maria APJ, Ayane L, Putarov TC, Loureiro BA, Neto BP, Casagrande MF, et al. The effect of
- age and carbohydrate and protein sources on digestibility, fecal microbiota, fermentation
- products, fecal IgA, and immunological blood parameters in dogs,. J Anim Sci. 2017;95:2452–
- 432 66. https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2016.1302
- 433 37. Swanson KS, Vester BM, Apanavicius CJ, Kirby NA, Schook LB. Implications of age and diet
- on canine cerebral cortex transcription. Neurobiol Aging. 2009;30:1314–26.
- 435 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2007.10.017
- 436 38. Li P, Wu G. Characteristics of nutrition and metabolism in dogs and cats. Adv Exp Med Biol.
- 437 2024;1446:55–98. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54192-6\_4
- 438 39. Carciofi AC, Takakura FS, De-Oliveira LD, Teshima E, Jeremias JT, Brunetto MA, et al.
- Effects of six carbohydrate sources on dog diet digestibility and post-prandial glucose and
- insulin response. J Anim Physiol Anim Nutr. 2008;92:326–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-
- 441 0396.2007.00794.x
- 442 40. Tjernsbekk MT, Tauson AH, Ahlstrøm Ø. Ileal, colonic and total tract nutrient digestibility in
- dogs (Canis familiaris) compared with total tract digestibility in mink (Neovison vison). Arch
- 444 Anim Nutr. 2014;68:245–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/1745039X.2014.915137
- 445 41. Wu G. Recent advances in the nutrition and metabolism of dogs and cats. Adv Exp Med Biol.
- 446 2024;1446:1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54192-6 1
- 447 42. Watson T. Breaking it down–measuring food quality and digestibility. Vet Times. 2011;41:22-
- 448 4.
- 449 43. Baum B, Meneses F, Kleinschmidt S, Nolte I, Hewicker-Trautwein M. Age-related
- 450 histomorphologic changes in the canine Gastrointestinal tract: A histologic and
- 451 immunohistologic study. World J Gastroenterol. 2007;13:152.
- 452 https://doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v13.i1.152
- 453 44. Silvio J, Harmon DL, Gross KL, McLeod KR. Influence of fiber fermentability on nutrient
- digestion in the dog. Nutrition. 2000;16:289–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-
- 455 9007(99)00298-1

- 456 45. Fernández-Pinteño A, Pilla R, Manteca X, Suchodolski J, Torre C, Salas-Mani A. Age-
- associated changes in intestinal health biomarkers in dogs. Front Vet Sci. 2023;10:1213287.
- 458 https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2023.1213287
- 459 46. You I, Kim MJ. Comparison of gut microbiota of 96 healthy dogs by individual traits: Breed,
- age, and body condition score. Animals. 2021;11:2432. https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11082432
- 461 47. Mizukami K, Uchiyama J, Igarashi H, Murakami H, Osumi T, Shima A, et al. Age-related
- analysis of the gut microbiome in a purebred dog colony. FEMS Microbiol Lett. 2019;366:fnz95.
- https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/femsle/fnz095
- 48. Blake AB, Cigarroa A, Klein HL, Khattab MR, Keating T, Van De Coevering P, et al.
- Developmental stages in microbiota, bile acids, and clostridial species in healthy puppies. J Vet
- 466 Intern Med. 2020;34:2345–56. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvim.15928
- 467 49. Kim S, Cho JH, Kim HB, Song M. Evaluation of brown rice to replace corn in weanling pig
- diet. J Anim Sci Technol. 2021;63:1344–54. https://doi.org/10.5187/jast.2021.e112
- 50. Kim KH, Chang JS, Oh YK. Nutrient digestibilities and fecal characteristics of diets including
- brown rice for miniature schnauzer. J Anim Sci Technol. 2011;53:429-34.
- 471 https://doi.org/10.5187/JAST.2011.53.5.429
- 51. Twomey LN, Pluske JR, Rowe JB, Choct M, Brown W, Pethick DW. The replacement value
- of sorghum and maize with or without supplemental enzymes for rice in extruded dog foods.
- 474 Anim Feed Sci Technol. 2003;108:61–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-8401(03)00168-8
- 52. He W, Connolly ED, Wu G. Characteristics of the digestive tract of dogs and cats. Adv Exp
- 476 Med Biol. 2024;1446:15–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54192-6\_2
- 53. Dobenecker B. Influence of calcium and phosphorus intake on the apparent digestibility of
- 478 these minerals in growing dogs. J Nutr. 2002;132:1665S-1667S.
- 479 https://doi.org/10.1093/jn/132.6.1665S
- 480 54. Hendriks WH, Thomas DG, Bosch G, Fahey GC. Comparison of ileal and total tract nutrient
- digestibility of dry dog foods. J Anim Sci. 2013;91:3807–14. https://doi.org/10.2527/jas.2012-
- 482 5864
- 483 55. Metzger FL, Rebar AH. Clinical pathology interpretation in geriatric veterinary patients. Vet
- 484 Clin N Am Small Anim Pract. 2012;42:615–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cvsm.2012.04.004
- 485 56. Blount DG, Pritchard DI, Heaton PR. Age-related alterations to immune parameters in
- 486 Labrador retriever dogs. Vet Immunol Immunopathol. 2005;108:399–407.
- 487 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2005.06.015

- 488 57. Rørtveit R, Sævik BK, Eggertsdóttir A V., Skancke E, Lingaas F, Thoresen SI, et al. Age-
- related changes in hematologic and serum biochemical variables in dogs aged 16–60 days. Vet
- 490 Clin Pathol. 2015;44:47–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/vcp.12220
- 491 58. Chang YM, Hadox E, Szladovits B, Garden OA. Serum biochemical phenotypes in the
- domestic dog. PLoS One. 2016;11:e0149650. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0149650
- 493 59. Pati S, Panda SK, Acharya AP, Senapati S, Behera M, Behera SS. Evaluation of geriatric
- 494 changes in dogs. Vet World. 2015;8:273. https://doi.org/ 10.14202/vetworld.2015.273-278
- 495 60. Lee SH, Kim JW, Lee BC, Oh HJ. Age-specific variations in hematological and biochemical
- 496 parameters in middle- and large-sized of dogs. J Vet Sci. 2020;21:e7.
- 497 https://doi.org/10.4142/jvs.2020.21.e7
- 498 61. Hadžimusić N, Hadžijunuzović-Alagić D. Hematological and biochemical parameters in the
- blood of working Belgian Shepherd dogs: An age-related study. Open Vet J. 2024;14:2893.
- 500 https://doi.org/10.5455/OVJ.2024.v14.i11.18
- 501 62. Rosset E, Rannou B, Casseleux G, Chalvet-Monfray K, Buff S. Age-related changes in
- biochemical and hematologic variables in Borzoi and Beagle puppies from birth to 8 weeks. Vet
- 503 Clin Pathol. 2012;41:272–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-165X.2012.00415.x
- 63. Hall JA, Yerramilli M, Obare E, Yerramilli M, Melendez LD, Jewell DE. Relationship between
- lean body mass and serum renal biomarkers in healthy dogs. J Vet Intern Med. 2015;29:808–
- 506 14. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvim.12607
- 507 64. Kyoung H, Shin I, Kim Y, Cho JH, Park K II, Kim Y, et al. Mixed supplementation of dietary
- inorganic and organic selenium modulated systemic health parameters and fecal microbiota in
- weaned pigs. Front Vet Sci. 2025;12:1531336. https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2025.1531336

512 Tables

514

515

516

517518

519

520

Table 1. Composition of experimental food for Beagle dogs (as-fed basis)

Item	Basal diet
Ingredient, %	
Hydrolyzed chicken powder	35.00
Brown rice	32.65
Soy protein	15.00
Tapioca starch	5.00
Canola oil	3.00
Sweet pumpkin	2.00
Cabbage	2.00
Carrot	1.00
Monocalcium phosphate	1.80
Calcium carbonate	1.60
Vitamin-mineral premix <sup>1</sup>	0.50
Tocopherol	0.05
Salt	0.40
Total	100.00
Calculated composition	
Dry matter, %	91.09
Metabolizable energy², kcal/kg	3,707
Crude protein, %	40.17
Crude fat, %	6.23
Crude fiber, %	2.72
Calcium, %	0.79
Phosphorus, %	0.66
Crude ash, %	6.55
Nitrogen-free extract, %	35.42

<sup>1</sup>Vitamin and mineral premix supplied per kg of diets: 3,500 IU vitamin A; 250 IU vitamin D3; 25 mg vitamin E; 0.052 mg vitamin K; 2.8 mg vitamin B1(thiamine); 2.6 mg vitamin B2 (riboflavin); 2 mg vitamin B6 (pyridoxine); 0.014 mg vitamin B12; 6 mg Cal-d-pantothenate; 30 mg niacin; 0.4 mg folic acid; 0.036 mg biotin; 1,000 mg taurine; 44 mg FeSO<sup>4</sup>; 3.8 mg MnSO<sup>4</sup>; 50 mg ZnSO<sup>4</sup>; 7.5 mg CuSO<sup>4</sup>; 0.18 mg Na<sup>2</sup>SeO<sup>3</sup>; 0.9 mg Ca(IO<sup>3</sup>)<sup>2</sup>.

 $^2$ Metabolizable energy (ME) was calculated follow equation; ME (kcal/kg) – ([CP  $\times$  3.5] + [EE  $\times$  8.5] + [NFE  $\times$  3.5])  $\times$  10.

522

523

524

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Analyzed composition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The maximum calcium content level on a dry matter basis for other life stages including non-large size, and for large size dogs (those weighing 70 pounds or more as mature), the maximum is 1.8% [19].

**Table 3.** Age-related changes in growth and fecal parameters of Beagle dogs<sup>1</sup>

Item <sup>2</sup>	Puppy	Adult	Senior	SEM	<i>p</i> -value
Body size					
Initial body weight, kg	6.21 <sup>b</sup>	8.16 <sup>a</sup>	$6.95^{ab}$	0.42	0.016
Final body weight, kg	6.94	8.23	6.91	0.47	0.104
Body weight change, g/d	$72.50^{a}$	$7.17^{b}$	-3.83 <sup>b</sup>	11.54	< 0.001
Initial body condition score	5.50	4.50	5.58	0.58	0.369
Final body condition score	5.00	4.67	4.58	0.37	0.711
Food intake					
Daily food intake, g/d (as-is)	210.33a	172.33 <sup>b</sup>	121.53°	6.54	< 0.001
Daily food intake, g/d (DM basis)	191.60 <sup>a</sup>	156.99 <sup>b</sup>	110.71 <sup>c</sup>	5.95	< 0.001
Daily food intake, kcal/d	932.52a	764.04 <sup>b</sup>	538.81 <sup>c</sup>	28.98	< 0.001
Feces					
Daily fecal output, g/d (as-is)	63.75 <sup>a</sup>	44.80 <sup>b</sup>	31.76°	2.16	< 0.001
Daily fecal output, g/d (DM basis)	$20.98^{a}$	16.11 <sup>b</sup>	12.32°	1.01	< 0.001
Daily fecal output, kcal/d	66.27 <sup>a</sup>	49.64 <sup>b</sup>	39.82 <sup>b</sup>	3.41	< 0.001
Fecal score	3.07	2.73	2.63	0.15	0.123
Fecal moisture, %	67.12 <sup>a</sup>	63.97 <sup>ab</sup>	61.35 <sup>b</sup>	1.11	0.008
Diarrhea frequency, %	27.08 <sup>a</sup>	8.33 <sup>b</sup>	6.25 <sup>b</sup>		0.022
Hard dry feces frequency, %	0.00	0.00	4.17		0.143

<sup>1</sup>Each value is the mean of 6 replicates (one dog per cage).

 $^2$ Puppy, under 1 year old; Adult, 1–7 years old; Senior, over 7 years old; BW, body weight; ADG, average daily gain; ADFI, average daily food intake; FCR, food conversion ratio; BCS, body condition score; Diarrhea frequency = (number of fecal score  $\geq 3.5$  / number of cage days)  $\times$  100; Hard dry feces frequency = (number of fecal score < 2.0 / number of cage days)  $\times$  100.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a-c</sup>Means with different superscript letters within a row are different (p < 0.05).

**Table 4.** Age-related changes in apparent total tract nutrient digestibility of Beagle dogs<sup>1</sup>

536

537

538539

Item <sup>2</sup>	Puppy	Adult	Senior	SEM	<i>p</i> -value
Dry matter, %	89.07	89.76	88.95	0.39	0.323
Organic matter, %	95.49	96.10	95.27	0.32	0.192
Gross energy, %	92.90	93.51	92.68	0.37	0.289
Crude protein, %	92.39 <sup>a</sup>	91.77 <sup>a</sup>	89.99 <sup>b</sup>	0.35	0.001
Ether extract, %	82.66 <sup>b</sup>	85.28 <sup>a</sup>	85.53 <sup>a</sup>	0.57	0.005
Crude fiber, %	79.82 <sup>b</sup>	83.57 <sup>a</sup>	$83.80^{a}$	0.60	< 0.001
Crude ash, %	64.58 <sup>x</sup>	61.76 <sup>xy</sup>	58.87 <sup>y</sup>	1.66	0.082
Nitrogen-free extract, %	90.51 <sup>b</sup>	92.42 <sup>a</sup>	92.52ª	0.34	0.001
Calcium, %	82.49°	84.45 <sup>b</sup>	86.47 <sup>a</sup>	0.62	0.002
Phosphorus, %	80.27 <sup>b</sup>	85.01 <sup>a</sup>	85.35 <sup>a</sup>	0.64	< 0.001

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Each value is the mean of 6 replicates (one dog per cage).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Puppy, under 1 year old; Adult, 1–7 years old; Senior, over 7 years old.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a-c</sup>Means with different superscript letters within a row are different (p < 0.05).

x,yMeans with different superscript letters within a row are different (p < 0.10).

**Table 5.** Age-related changes in apparent total tract amino acid digestibility of Beagle dogs<sup>1</sup>

Item <sup>2</sup>	Puppy	Adult	Senior	SEM	<i>p</i> -value
Indispensable amino acids					
Arginine	97.78	97.93	97.78	0.09	0.462
Histidine	97.63	97.86	97.73	0.11	0.339
Isoleucine	97.68	97.83	97.68	0.09	0.443
Leucine	97.68	97.83	97.67	0.09	0.416
Lysine	97.77	97.91	97.76	0.09	0.456
Methionine	97.69	97.85	97.72	0.13	0.671
Phenylalanine	97.70	97.85	97.71	0.09	0.450
Threonine	97.73	97.88	97.73	0.09	0.428
Tryptophan	97.59	97.75	97.63	0.15	0.750
Valine	97.62	97.77	97.62	0.10	0.467
Dispensable amino acids					
Alanine	97.53	97.71	97.55	0.16	0.693
Aspartic acid	97.68	97.83	97.67	0.09	0.386
Cysteine	97.40	97.57	97.41	0.12	0.548
Glutamic acid	97.70	97.85	97.69	0.08	0.357
Glycine	97.67	97.82	97.67	0.09	0.426
Proline	97.74	97.89	97.74	0.09	0.447
Serine	97.68	97.83	97.68	0.11	0.547
Tyrosine	98.08	98.22	98.12	0.11	0.681

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Each value is the mean of 6 replicates (one dog per cage).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Puppy, under 1 year old; Adult, 1–7 years old; Senior, over 7 years old.

**Table 6.** Age-related changes in hematological profile of Beagle dogs<sup>1</sup>

White blood cell, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   10.70°   7.56°   7.60°   0.83   0.026     Neutrophil, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   7.56°   5.14°   5.07°   0.70   0.040     Lymphocyte, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   2.01   1.70   1.64   0.19   0.354     Monocyte, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   0.51°   0.31°   0.27°   0.03   < 0.001     Eosinophil, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   0.53   0.39   0.56   0.12   0.531     Neutrophil, %   69.77   67.81   66.46   2.29   0.599     Lymphocyte, %   19.22   22.49   21.78   1.78   0.415     Monocyte, %   4.94   4.25   3.85   0.53   0.360     Eosinophil, %   5.14   5.15   7.12   1.15   0.400     Red blood cell, ×10 <sup>6</sup> /μL   6.24   6.84   6.13   0.26   0.157     Hemoglobin, g/dL   14.78   16.07   13.93   0.67   0.109     Hematocrit, %   41.37   44.12   39.72   1.79   0.245     MCV fL   66.37   64.55   64.72   0.99   0.381     MCH, pg   23.67   23.53   22.67   0.41   0.202     MCHC, g/dL   35.68°   36.43°   35.05°   0.20   0.001     RDW-CV, %   13.32   12.87   13.37   0.28   0.413     RDW-SD, fL   34.55   32.48   33.42   0.63   0.102     Platelet, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   268.83   325.17   132.67   64.59   0.130     MPV, fL   9.50   9.98   8.97   0.47   0.336     Day 10     White blood cell, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   6.29°   5.97°   4.12°   0.71   0.096     Lymphocyte, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   0.50   0.40   0.34   0.06   0.213     Eosinophil, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   0.08   0.10   0.09   0.02   0.755     Neutrophil, %   72.10°   77.58°   69.62°   2.31   0.074     Lymphocyte, %   5.80   5.19   5.99   0.71   0.115     Eosinophil, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL   6.63   7.00   6.64   0.19   0.308     Hematocrit, %   45.58   45.75   43.43   1.19   0.334     Hematocrit, %   45.58   45.75   43.43	Item <sup>2</sup>	Puppy	Adult	Senior	SEM	<i>p</i> -value
Neutrophil, ×10³/μL 7.56° 5.14° 5.07° 0.70 0.040 Lymphocyte, ×10³/μL 2.01 1.70 1.64 0.19 0.354 Monocyte, ×10³/μL 0.51° 0.31° 0.27° 0.03 <0.001 Eosinophil, ×10³/μL 0.53° 0.39 0.56 0.12 0.531 Neutrophil, % 69.77 67.81 66.46 2.29 0.599 Lymphocyte, % 19.22 22.49 21.78 1.78 0.415 Monocyte, % 4.94 4.25 3.85 0.53 0.360 Eosinophil, % 5.14 5.15 7.12 1.15 0.400 Red blood cell, ×10°/μL 6.24 6.84 6.13 0.26 0.157 Hemoglobin, g/dL 14.78 16.07 13.93 0.67 0.109 Hematocrit, % 41.37 44.12 39.72 1.79 0.245 MCH, pg 23.67 23.53 22.67 0.41 0.202 MCHC, g/dL 35.68° 36.43° 35.05° 0.20 0.001 RDW-CV, % 13.32 12.87 13.37 0.28 0.413 RDW-SD, fL 34.55 32.48 33.42 0.63 0.102 Platelet, ×10³/μL 268.83 325.17 132.67 64.59 0.130 MPV, fL 9.50 9.98 8.97 0.47 0.336 Day 10 White blood cell, ×10³/μL 1.76° 1.12° 1.32° 0.71 0.096 Lymphocyte, ×10³/μL 1.76° 1.12° 1.32° 0.75 0.70 0.001 RDW-CV, ×10³/μL 1.76° 1.12° 1.32° 0.75 0.70 0.001 C.20 0.20 0.001 C.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20 0.20	Day 1					
Lymphocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$	White blood cell, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	$10.70^{a}$	7.56 <sup>b</sup>	$7.60^{b}$	0.83	0.026
Monocyte, ×10 $^3$ /μL	Neutrophil, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	7.56 <sup>a</sup>	5.14 <sup>b</sup>	$5.07^{b}$	0.70	0.040
Eosinophil, $\times 10^3/\mu L$ 0.53         0.39         0.56         0.12         0.531           Neutrophil, %         69.77         67.81         66.46         2.29         0.599           Lymphocyte, %         19.22         22.49         21.78         1.78         0.415           Monocyte, %         4.94         4.25         3.85         0.53         0.360           Eosinophil, %         5.14         5.15         7.12         1.15         0.400           Red blood cell, ×106/µL         6.24         6.84         6.13         0.26         0.157           Hemoglobin, g/dL         14.78         16.07         13.93         0.67         0.109           Hematocrit, %         41.37         44.12         39.72         1.79         0.245           MCV fL         66.37         64.55         64.72         0.99         0.381           MCH, pg         23.67         23.53         22.67         0.41         0.202           MCHC, g/dL         35.68b         36.43a         35.05c         0.20         0.001           RDW-SD, fL         34.55         32.48         33.42         0.63         0.102           Platelet, $\times 10^3/\mu$ L         268.83	Lymphocyte, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	2.01	1.70	1.64	0.19	0.354
Neutrophil, % 69.77 67.81 66.46 2.29 0.599 Lymphocyte, % 19.22 22.49 21.78 1.78 0.415 Monocyte, % 4.94 4.25 3.85 0.53 0.360 Eosinophil, % 5.14 5.15 7.12 1.15 0.400 Red blood cell, ×106/μL 6.24 6.84 6.13 0.26 0.157 Hemoglobin, g/dL 14.78 16.07 13.93 0.67 0.109 Hematocrit, % 41.37 44.12 39.72 1.79 0.245 MCV fL 66.37 64.55 64.72 0.99 0.381 MCH, pg 23.67 23.53 22.67 0.41 0.202 MCHC, g/dL 35.68 36.43 35.05 0.20 0.001 RDW-CV, % 13.32 12.87 13.37 0.28 0.413 RDW-SD, fL 34.55 32.48 33.42 0.63 0.102 Platelet, ×103/μL 268.83 325.17 132.67 64.59 0.130 MPV, fL 9.50 9.98 8.97 0.47 0.336 Day 10  White blood cell, ×103/μL 8.71 7.62 \$5.89 0.78 0.062 Neutrophil, ×103/μL 1.76 1.12 \$1.32 \$0.71 0.096 Lymphocyte, ×103/μL 0.50 0.40 0.34 0.06 0.213 Eosinophil, ×103/μL 0.50 0.40 0.34 0.06 0.213 Eosinophil, ×103/μL 0.50 0.40 0.34 0.06 0.213 Eosinophil, ×103/μL 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.02 0.755 Neutrophil, % 72.10 \$7.58 69.62 2.31 0.074 Lymphocyte, % 20.24 15.55 22.69 2.30 0.117 Monocyte, % 5.80 5.19 5.99 0.71 0.715 Eosinophil, % 0.87 1.29 1.47 0.27 0.289 Red blood cells, ×106/μL 6.63 7.00 6.64 0.19 0.308 Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	Monocyte, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	0.51 <sup>a</sup>	$0.31^{b}$	$0.27^{b}$	0.03	< 0.001
Lymphocyte, % 19.22 22.49 21.78 1.78 0.415 Monocyte, % 4.94 4.25 3.85 0.53 0.360 Eosinophil, % 5.14 5.15 7.12 1.15 0.400 Red blood cell, ×10 <sup>6</sup> /μL 6.24 6.84 6.13 0.26 0.157 Hemoglobin, g/dL 14.78 16.07 13.93 0.67 0.109 Hematocrit, % 41.37 44.12 39.72 1.79 0.245 MCV fL 66.37 64.55 64.72 0.99 0.381 MCH, pg 23.67 23.53 22.67 0.41 0.202 MCHC, g/dL 35.68 <sup>b</sup> 36.43 <sup>a</sup> 35.05 <sup>c</sup> 0.20 0.001 RDW-CV, % 13.32 12.87 13.37 0.28 0.413 RDW-SD, fL 34.55 32.48 33.42 0.63 0.102 Platelet, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 268.83 325.17 132.67 64.59 0.130 MPV, fL 9.50 9.98 8.97 0.47 0.336 Day 10  White blood cell, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 8.71 <sup>x</sup> 7.62 <sup>xy</sup> 5.89 <sup>y</sup> 0.78 0.062 Neutrophil, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 1.76 <sup>a</sup> 1.12 <sup>b</sup> 1.32 <sup>ab</sup> 0.17 0.096 Lymphocyte, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 1.76 <sup>a</sup> 1.12 <sup>b</sup> 1.32 <sup>ab</sup> 0.17 0.049 Monocyte, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.02 0.755 Neutrophil, % 72.10 <sup>xy</sup> 77.58 <sup>x</sup> 69.62 <sup>y</sup> 2.31 0.074 Lymphocyte, % 20.24 15.55 22.69 2.30 0.117 Monocyte, % 5.80 5.19 5.99 0.71 0.715 Eosinophil, % 0.87 1.29 1.47 0.27 0.289 Red blood cells, ×10 <sup>9</sup> /μL 6.63 7.00 6.64 0.19 0.308 Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	Eosinophil, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	0.53	0.39	0.56	0.12	0.531
Monocyte, %         4.94         4.25         3.85         0.53         0.360           Eosinophil, %         5.14         5.15         7.12         1.15         0.400           Red blood cell, ×10%μL         6.24         6.84         6.13         0.26         0.157           Hemoglobin, g/dL         14.78         16.07         13.93         0.67         0.109           Hematocrit, %         41.37         44.12         39.72         1.79         0.245           MCV fL         66.37         64.55         64.72         0.99         0.381           MCH, pg         23.67         23.53         22.67         0.41         0.202           MCHC, g/dL         35.68%         36.43%         35.05°         0.20         0.001           RDW-CV, %         13.32         12.87         13.37         0.28         0.413           RDW-SD, fL         34.55         32.48         33.42         0.63         0.102           Platelet, ×10³/μL         268.83         325.17         132.67         64.59         0.130           MPV, fL         9.50         9.98         8.97         0.47         0.336           Day 10         White blood cell, ×10³/μL         8.71* </td <td>Neutrophil, %</td> <td>69.77</td> <td>67.81</td> <td>66.46</td> <td>2.29</td> <td>0.599</td>	Neutrophil, %	69.77	67.81	66.46	2.29	0.599
Eosinophil, %         5.14         5.15         7.12         1.15         0.400           Red blood cell, ×106/μL         6.24         6.84         6.13         0.26         0.157           Hemoglobin, g/dL         14.78         16.07         13.93         0.67         0.109           Hematocrit, %         41.37         44.12         39.72         1.79         0.245           MCV fL         66.37         64.55         64.72         0.99         0.381           MCH, pg         23.67         23.53         22.67         0.41         0.202           MCHC, g/dL         35.68b         36.43a         35.05c         0.20         0.001           RDW-CV, %         13.32         12.87         13.37         0.28         0.413           RDW-SD, fL         34.55         32.48         33.42         0.63         0.102           Platelet, ×10³/μL         268.83         325.17         132.67         64.59         0.130           MPV, fL         9.50         9.98         8.97         0.47         0.336           Day 10           White blood cell, ×10³/μL         8.71°         7.62°         5.89°         0.78         0.062	Lymphocyte, %	19.22	22.49	21.78	1.78	0.415
Red blood cell, ×10 <sup>6</sup> /μL	Monocyte, %	4.94	4.25	3.85	0.53	0.360
Hemoglobin, g/dL         14.78         16.07         13.93         0.67         0.109           Hematocrit, %         41.37         44.12         39.72         1.79         0.245           MCV fL         66.37         64.55         64.72         0.99         0.381           MCH, pg         23.67         23.53         22.67         0.41         0.202           MCHC, g/dL         35.68b         36.43a         35.05c         0.20         0.001           RDW-CV, %         13.32         12.87         13.37         0.28         0.413           RDW-SD, fL         34.55         32.48         33.42         0.63         0.102           Platelet, ×10³/μL         268.83         325.17         132.67         64.59         0.130           MPV, fL         9.50         9.98         8.97         0.47         0.336           Day 10         White blood cell, ×10³/μL         8.71°         7.62°         5.89°         0.78         0.062           Neutrophil, ×10³/μL         6.29°         5.97°         4.12°         0.71         0.096           Lymphocyte, ×10³/μL         0.50         0.40         0.34         0.06         0.213           Eosinophil, % </td <td>Eosinophil, %</td> <td>5.14</td> <td>5.15</td> <td>7.12</td> <td>1.15</td> <td>0.400</td>	Eosinophil, %	5.14	5.15	7.12	1.15	0.400
Hematocrit, %         41.37         44.12         39.72         1.79         0.245           MCV fL         66.37         64.55         64.72         0.99         0.381           MCH, pg         23.67         23.53         22.67         0.41         0.202           MCHC, g/dL         35.68b         36.43a         35.05c         0.20         0.001           RDW-CV, %         13.32         12.87         13.37         0.28         0.413           RDW-SD, fL         34.55         32.48         33.42         0.63         0.102           Platelet, ×10³/μL         268.83         325.17         132.67         64.59         0.130           MPV, fL         9.50         9.98         8.97         0.47         0.336           Day 10         White blood cell, ×10³/μL         8.71x         7.62xy         5.89y         0.78         0.062           Neutrophil, ×10³/μL         6.29x         5.97xy         4.12y         0.71         0.096           Lymphocyte, ×10³/μL         1.76a         1.12b         1.32ab         0.17         0.049           Monocyte, ×10³/μL         0.50         0.40         0.34         0.06         0.213           Eosinophil, ×10³/μL <td>Red blood cell, <math>\times 10^6/\mu L</math></td> <td>6.24</td> <td>6.84</td> <td>6.13</td> <td>0.26</td> <td>0.157</td>	Red blood cell, $\times 10^6/\mu L$	6.24	6.84	6.13	0.26	0.157
MCV fL $66.37$ $64.55$ $64.72$ $0.99$ $0.381$ MCH, pg $23.67$ $23.53$ $22.67$ $0.41$ $0.202$ MCHC, g/dL $35.68^b$ $36.43^a$ $35.05^c$ $0.20$ $0.001$ RDW-CV, % $13.32$ $12.87$ $13.37$ $0.28$ $0.413$ RDW-SD, fL $34.55$ $32.48$ $33.42$ $0.63$ $0.102$ Platelet, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL $9.50$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98$ $9.98 9.99 9.98 9.98 9.98 9.98 9.98 9.98 9.98$	Hemoglobin, g/dL	14.78	16.07	13.93	0.67	0.109
MCH, pg 23.67 23.53 22.67 0.41 0.202 MCHC, g/dL 35.68 $^{\rm h}$ 36.43 $^{\rm a}$ 35.05 $^{\rm c}$ 0.20 0.001 RDW-CV, % 13.32 12.87 13.37 0.28 0.413 RDW-SD, fL 34.55 32.48 33.42 0.63 0.102 Platelet, ×10 $^3$ /μL 268.83 325.17 132.67 64.59 0.130 MPV, fL 9.50 9.98 8.97 0.47 0.336 Day 10 White blood cell, ×10 $^3$ /μL 8.71 $^{\rm x}$ 7.62 $^{\rm xy}$ 5.89 $^{\rm y}$ 0.78 0.062 Neutrophil, ×10 $^3$ /μL 6.29 $^{\rm x}$ 5.97 $^{\rm xy}$ 4.12 $^{\rm y}$ 0.71 0.096 Lymphocyte, ×10 $^3$ /μL 1.76 $^{\rm a}$ 1.12 $^{\rm b}$ 1.32 $^{\rm ab}$ 0.17 0.049 Monocyte, ×10 $^3$ /μL 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.02 0.755 Neutrophil, % 72.10 $^{\rm xy}$ 77.58 $^{\rm x}$ 69.62 $^{\rm y}$ 2.31 0.074 Lymphocyte, % 20.24 15.55 22.69 2.30 0.117 Monocyte, % 5.80 5.19 5.99 0.71 0.715 Eosinophil, % 0.87 1.29 1.47 0.27 0.289 Red blood cells, ×10 $^6$ /μL 6.63 7.00 6.64 0.19 0.308 Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	Hematocrit, %	41.37	44.12	39.72	1.79	0.245
MCHC, g/dL $35.68^b$ $36.43^a$ $35.05^c$ $0.20$ $0.001$ RDW-CV, % $13.32$ $12.87$ $13.37$ $0.28$ $0.413$ RDW-SD, fL $34.55$ $32.48$ $33.42$ $0.63$ $0.102$ Platelet, ×10³/μL $268.83$ $325.17$ $132.67$ $64.59$ $0.130$ MPV, fL $9.50$ $9.98$ $8.97$ $0.47$ $0.336$ Day 10  White blood cell, ×10³/μL $8.71^x$ $7.62^{xy}$ $5.89^y$ $0.78$ $0.062$ Neutrophil, ×10³/μL $6.29^x$ $5.97^{xy}$ $4.12^y$ $0.71$ $0.096$ Lymphocyte, ×10³/μL $1.76^a$ $1.12^b$ $1.32^{ab}$ $0.17$ $0.049$ Monocyte, ×10³/μL $0.50$ $0.40$ $0.34$ $0.06$ $0.213$ Eosinophil, ×10³/μL $0.08$ $0.10$ $0.09$ $0.02$ $0.755$ Neutrophil, % $72.10^{xy}$ $77.58^x$ $69.62^y$ $2.31$ $0.074$ Lymphocyte, % $5.80$ $5.19$ $5.99$ $0.71$ $0.715$ Eosinophil, % $0.87$ $1.29$ $1.47$ $0.27$ $0.289$ Red blood cells, ×10 <sup>6</sup> /μL $6.63$ $7.00$ $6.64$ $0.19$ $0.308$ Hemoglobin, g/dL $16.07$ $16.28$ $15.10$ $0.39$ $0.103$	MCV fL	66.37	64.55	64.72	0.99	0.381
RDW-CV, % 13.32 12.87 13.37 0.28 0.413 RDW-SD, fL 34.55 32.48 33.42 0.63 0.102 Platelet, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 268.83 325.17 132.67 64.59 0.130 MPV, fL 9.50 9.98 8.97 0.47 0.336 Day 10 White blood cell, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 8.71 <sup>x</sup> 7.62 <sup>xy</sup> 5.89 <sup>y</sup> 0.78 0.062 Neutrophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 6.29 <sup>x</sup> 5.97 <sup>xy</sup> 4.12 <sup>y</sup> 0.71 0.096 Lymphocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 1.76 <sup>a</sup> 1.12 <sup>b</sup> 1.32 <sup>ab</sup> 0.17 0.049 Monocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.50 0.40 0.34 0.06 0.213 Eosinophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.02 0.755 Neutrophil, % 72.10 <sup>xy</sup> 77.58 <sup>x</sup> 69.62 <sup>y</sup> 2.31 0.074 Lymphocyte, % 20.24 15.55 22.69 2.30 0.117 Monocyte, % 20.24 15.55 22.69 2.30 0.117 Monocyte, % 5.80 5.19 5.99 0.71 0.715 Eosinophil, % 0.87 1.29 1.47 0.27 0.289 Red blood cells, $\times 10^6 / \mu L$ 6.63 7.00 6.64 0.19 0.308 Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	MCH, pg	23.67	23.53	22.67	0.41	0.202
RDW-SD, fL $34.55$ $32.48$ $33.42$ $0.63$ $0.102$ Platelet, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ $268.83$ $325.17$ $132.67$ $64.59$ $0.130$ MPV, fL $9.50$ $9.98$ $8.97$ $0.47$ $0.336$ Day 10  White blood cell, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ $8.71^{\times}$ $7.62^{\times y}$ $5.89^{y}$ $0.78$ $0.062$ Neutrophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ $6.29^{\times}$ $5.97^{\times y}$ $4.12^{y}$ $0.71$ $0.096$ Lymphocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ $1.76^a$ $1.12^b$ $1.32^{ab}$ $0.17$ $0.049$ Monocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ $0.50$ $0.40$ $0.34$ $0.06$ $0.213$ Eosinophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ $0.08$ $0.10$ $0.09$ $0.02$ $0.755$ Neutrophil, % $72.10^{\times y}$ $77.58^{\times}$ $69.62^{y}$ $2.31$ $0.074$ Lymphocyte, % $20.24$ $15.55$ $22.69$ $2.30$ $0.117$ Monocyte, % $5.80$ $5.19$ $5.99$ $0.71$ $0.715$ Eosinophil, % $0.87$ $1.29$ $1.47$ $0.27$ $0.289$ Red blood cells, $\times 10^6 / \mu L$ $6.63$ $7.00$ $6.64$ $0.19$ $0.308$ Hemoglobin, g/dL $16.07$ $16.28$ $15.10$ $0.39$ $0.103$	MCHC, g/dL	35.68 <sup>b</sup>	36.43 <sup>a</sup>	35.05 <sup>c</sup>	0.20	0.001
Platelet, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 268.83 325.17 132.67 64.59 0.130 MPV, fL 9.50 9.98 8.97 0.47 0.336 Day 10 White blood cell, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 8.71 7.62xy 5.89y 0.78 0.062 Neutrophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 6.29x 5.97xy 4.12y 0.71 0.096 Lymphocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 1.76a 1.12b 1.32ab 0.17 0.049 Monocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.50 0.40 0.34 0.06 0.213 Eosinophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.02 0.755 Neutrophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.02 0.755 Neutrophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.08 5.80 5.19 5.99 0.71 0.715 Eosinophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.87 1.29 1.47 0.27 0.289 Red blood cells, $\times 10^6 / \mu L$ 6.63 7.00 6.64 0.19 0.308 Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	RDW-CV, %	13.32	12.87	13.37	0.28	0.413
MPV, flL 9.50 9.98 8.97 0.47 0.336 Day 10 White blood cell, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 8.71 <sup>x</sup> 7.62 <sup>xy</sup> 5.89 <sup>y</sup> 0.78 0.062 Neutrophil, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 6.29 <sup>x</sup> 5.97 <sup>xy</sup> 4.12 <sup>y</sup> 0.71 0.096 Lymphocyte, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 1.76 <sup>a</sup> 1.12 <sup>b</sup> 1.32 <sup>ab</sup> 0.17 0.049 Monocyte, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 0.50 0.40 0.34 0.06 0.213 Eosinophil, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.02 0.755 Neutrophil, % 72.10 <sup>xy</sup> 77.58 <sup>x</sup> 69.62 <sup>y</sup> 2.31 0.074 Lymphocyte, % 20.24 15.55 22.69 2.30 0.117 Monocyte, % 5.80 5.19 5.99 0.71 0.715 Eosinophil, % 0.87 1.29 1.47 0.27 0.289 Red blood cells, ×10 <sup>6</sup> /μL 6.63 7.00 6.64 0.19 0.308 Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	RDW-SD, fL	34.55	32.48	33.42	0.63	0.102
Day 10         White blood cell, ×10³/μL $8.71^x$ $7.62^{xy}$ $5.89^y$ $0.78$ $0.062$ Neutrophil, ×10³/μL $6.29^x$ $5.97^{xy}$ $4.12^y$ $0.71$ $0.096$ Lymphocyte, ×10³/μL $1.76^a$ $1.12^b$ $1.32^{ab}$ $0.17$ $0.049$ Monocyte, ×10³/μL $0.50$ $0.40$ $0.34$ $0.06$ $0.213$ Eosinophil, ×10³/μL $0.08$ $0.10$ $0.09$ $0.02$ $0.755$ Neutrophil, % $72.10^{xy}$ $77.58^x$ $69.62^y$ $2.31$ $0.074$ Lymphocyte, % $20.24$ $15.55$ $22.69$ $2.30$ $0.117$ Monocyte, % $5.80$ $5.19$ $5.99$ $0.71$ $0.715$ Eosinophil, % $0.87$ $1.29$ $1.47$ $0.27$ $0.289$ Red blood cells, ×106/μL $6.63$ $7.00$ $6.64$ $0.19$ $0.308$ Hemoglobin, g/dL $16.07$ $16.28$ $15.10$ $0.39$ $0.103$	Platelet, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	268.83	325.17	132.67	64.59	0.130
White blood cell, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL $8.71^{x}$ $7.62^{xy}$ $5.89^{y}$ $0.78$ $0.062$ Neutrophil, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL $6.29^{x}$ $5.97^{xy}$ $4.12^{y}$ $0.71$ $0.096$ Lymphocyte, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL $1.76^{a}$ $1.12^{b}$ $1.32^{ab}$ $0.17$ $0.049$ Monocyte, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL $0.50$ $0.40$ $0.34$ $0.06$ $0.213$ Eosinophil, ×10 <sup>3</sup> /μL $0.08$ $0.10$ $0.09$ $0.02$ $0.755$ Neutrophil, % $72.10^{xy}$ $77.58^{x}$ $69.62^{y}$ $2.31$ $0.074$ Lymphocyte, % $20.24$ $15.55$ $22.69$ $2.30$ $0.117$ Monocyte, % $5.80$ $5.19$ $5.99$ $0.71$ $0.715$ Eosinophil, % $0.87$ $1.29$ $1.47$ $0.27$ $0.289$ Red blood cells, ×10 <sup>6</sup> /μL $6.63$ $7.00$ $6.64$ $0.19$ $0.308$ Hemoglobin, g/dL $16.07$ $16.28$ $15.10$ $0.39$ $0.103$	MPV, fL	9.50	9.98	8.97	0.47	0.336
Neutrophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 6.29 <sup>x</sup> 5.97 <sup>xy</sup> 4.12 <sup>y</sup> 0.71 0.096 Lymphocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 1.76 <sup>a</sup> 1.12 <sup>b</sup> 1.32 <sup>ab</sup> 0.17 0.049 Monocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.50 0.40 0.34 0.06 0.213 Eosinophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.02 0.755 Neutrophil, % 72.10 <sup>xy</sup> 77.58 <sup>x</sup> 69.62 <sup>y</sup> 2.31 0.074 Lymphocyte, % 20.24 15.55 22.69 2.30 0.117 Monocyte, % 5.80 5.19 5.99 0.71 0.715 Eosinophil, % 0.87 1.29 1.47 0.27 0.289 Red blood cells, $\times 10^6 / \mu L$ 6.63 7.00 6.64 0.19 0.308 Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	Day 10					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	White blood cell, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	8.71 <sup>x</sup>	$7.62^{xy}$	5.89 <sup>y</sup>	0.78	0.062
Monocyte, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.50 0.40 0.34 0.06 0.213 Eosinophil, $\times 10^3 / \mu L$ 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.02 0.755 Neutrophil, % 72.10 <sup>xy</sup> 77.58 <sup>x</sup> 69.62 <sup>y</sup> 2.31 0.074 Lymphocyte, % 20.24 15.55 22.69 2.30 0.117 Monocyte, % 5.80 5.19 5.99 0.71 0.715 Eosinophil, % 0.87 1.29 1.47 0.27 0.289 Red blood cells, $\times 10^6 / \mu L$ 6.63 7.00 6.64 0.19 0.308 Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	Neutrophil, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	6.29 <sup>x</sup>	5.97 <sup>xy</sup>	4.12 <sup>y</sup>	0.71	0.096
Eosinophil, $\times 10^3/\mu L$ 0.080.100.090.020.755Neutrophil, % $72.10^{xy}$ $77.58^x$ $69.62^y$ 2.310.074Lymphocyte, %20.24 $15.55$ 22.692.300.117Monocyte, %5.805.195.990.710.715Eosinophil, %0.871.291.470.270.289Red blood cells, $\times 10^6/\mu L$ 6.637.006.640.190.308Hemoglobin, g/dL16.0716.2815.100.390.103	Lymphocyte, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	1.76 <sup>a</sup>	1.12 <sup>b</sup>	$1.32^{ab}$	0.17	0.049
Neutrophil, % $72.10^{xy}$ $77.58^{x}$ $69.62^{y}$ $2.31$ $0.074$ Lymphocyte, % $20.24$ $15.55$ $22.69$ $2.30$ $0.117$ Monocyte, % $5.80$ $5.19$ $5.99$ $0.71$ $0.715$ Eosinophil, % $0.87$ $1.29$ $1.47$ $0.27$ $0.289$ Red blood cells, $\times 10^6/\mu$ L $6.63$ $7.00$ $6.64$ $0.19$ $0.308$ Hemoglobin, g/dL $16.07$ $16.28$ $15.10$ $0.39$ $0.103$	Monocyte, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	0.50	0.40	0.34	0.06	0.213
Lymphocyte, %20.2415.5522.692.300.117Monocyte, %5.805.195.990.710.715Eosinophil, %0.871.291.470.270.289Red blood cells, $\times 10^6/\mu$ L6.637.006.640.190.308Hemoglobin, g/dL16.0716.2815.100.390.103	Eosinophil, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.02	0.755
Monocyte, % $5.80$ $5.19$ $5.99$ $0.71$ $0.715$ Eosinophil, % $0.87$ $1.29$ $1.47$ $0.27$ $0.289$ Red blood cells, $\times 10^6/\mu$ L $6.63$ $7.00$ $6.64$ $0.19$ $0.308$ Hemoglobin, g/dL $16.07$ $16.28$ $15.10$ $0.39$ $0.103$	Neutrophil, %	$72.10^{xy}$	77.58 <sup>x</sup>	69.62 <sup>y</sup>	2.31	0.074
Eosinophil, % $0.87$ $1.29$ $1.47$ $0.27$ $0.289$ Red blood cells, $×10^6/μ$ L $6.63$ $7.00$ $6.64$ $0.19$ $0.308$ Hemoglobin, g/dL $16.07$ $16.28$ $15.10$ $0.39$ $0.103$	Lymphocyte, %	20.24	15.55	22.69	2.30	0.117
Red blood cells, $\times 10^6/\mu L$ 6.63 7.00 6.64 0.19 0.308 Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	Monocyte, %	5.80	5.19	5.99	0.71	0.715
Hemoglobin, g/dL 16.07 16.28 15.10 0.39 0.103	Eosinophil, %	0.87	1.29	1.47	0.27	0.289
	Red blood cells, $\times 10^6 / \mu L$	6.63	7.00	6.64	0.19	0.308
Hematocrit, % 45.58 45.75 43.43 1.19 0.334	Hemoglobin, g/dL	16.07	16.28	15.10	0.39	0.103
	Hematocrit, %	45.58	45.75	43.43	1.19	0.334

MCV fL	$68.80^{a}$	65.48 <sup>b</sup>	65.40 <sup>b</sup>	0.99	0.046
MCH, pg	24.27 <sup>a</sup>	23.32 <sup>ab</sup>	22.72 <sup>b</sup>	0.34	0.019
MCHC, g/dL	35.35 <sup>xy</sup>	35.60 <sup>x</sup>	34.73 <sup>y</sup>	0.26	0.080
RDW-CV, %	13.08 <sup>b</sup>	12.90 <sup>b</sup>	14.23 <sup>a</sup>	0.33	0.024
RDW-SD, fL	34.92 <sup>ab</sup>	32.92 <sup>b</sup>	35.87 <sup>a</sup>	0.70	0.027
Platelet, $\times 10^3/\mu L$	218.50	169.00	146.33	46.74	0.550
MPV, fL	$9.10^{b}$	$10.40^{a}$	10.18 <sup>a</sup>	0.31	0.020

<sup>1</sup>Each value is the mean of 6 replicates (one dog per cage).

<sup>2</sup>Puppy, under 1 year old; Adult, 1–7 years old; Senior, over 7 years old; MPV, mean platelet volume; MCV, mean cell volume; MCH, mean corpuscular hemoglobin; MCHC, mean corpuscular hemoglobin concentration; RDW-CV, red blood cell distribution width-coefficient of variation; RDW-SD, red blood cell distribution width-standard deviation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a-c</sup>Means with different superscript letters within a row are different (p < 0.05).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>x,y</sup>Means with different superscript letters within a row are different (p < 0.10).

**Table 7.** Age-related changes in serum biochemical profile of Beagle dogs<sup>1</sup>

555

556

Item <sup>2</sup>	Puppy	Adult	Senior	SEM	<i>p</i> -value
Day 1					
Total protein, g/dL	5.15	5.15	5.17	0.03	0.923
Albumin, g/dL	3.57 <sup>a</sup>	$3.38^{a}$	$2.82^{b}$	0.17	0.017
Glucose, mg/dL	108.50 <sup>a</sup>	$101.00^{a}$	94.17 <sup>b</sup>	3.50	0.036
Triglyceride, mg/dL	$35.50^{y}$	36.00 <sup>xy</sup>	$46.00^{x}$	3.47	0.085
Total cholesterol, mg/dL	142.50	174.83	165.67	14.75	0.308
Creatinine, mg/dL	$0.34^{a}$	$0.34^{a}$	$0.20^{b}$	0.03	0.007
Blood urea nitrogen, mg/dL	16.77 <sup>y</sup>	25.44 <sup>x</sup>	21.22 <sup>xy</sup>	2.44	0.072
Calcium, mg/dL	9.71	8.79	8.48	0.45	0.164
Alkaline phosphatase, U/L	95.33 <sup>a</sup>	34.00 <sup>b</sup>	47.50 <sup>b</sup>	15.44	0.032
Aspartate aminotransferase, U/L	50.00	28.50	33.00	9.35	0.261
Alanine aminotransferase, U/L	37.40	32.83	26.00	3.41	0.108
Day 10					
Total protein, g/dL	5.83	4.35	5.73	0.99	0.513
Albumin, g/dL	4.13 <sup>a</sup>	3.92a	3.42 <sup>b</sup>	0.09	< 0.001
Glucose, mg/dL	109.00 <sup>a</sup>	103.50 <sup>a</sup>	93.17 <sup>b</sup>	3.17	0.010
Triglyceride, mg/dL	40.50	41.33	41.17	3.45	0.984
Total cholesterol, mg/dL	124.50	162.17	148.83	13.07	0.152
Creatinine, mg/dL	$0.30^{a}$	0.33 <sup>a</sup>	$0.23^{b}$	0.02	0.005
Blood urea nitrogen, mg/dL	40.18 <sup>a</sup>	$30.98^{b}$	26.12 <sup>b</sup>	2.00	< 0.001
Calcium, mg/dL	10.76 <sup>a</sup>	9.64 <sup>b</sup>	9.72 <sup>b</sup>	0.15	< 0.001
Alkaline phosphatase, U/L	70.50 <sup>a</sup>	$26.50^{b}$	$36.00^{b}$	4.54	< 0.001
Aspartate aminotransferase, U/L	36.83	40.83	41.67	5.37	0.796
Alanine aminotransferase, U/L	33.80	34.33	39.00	3.49	0.590

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Each value is the mean of 6 replicates (one dog per cage).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Puppy, under 1 year old; Adult, 1–7 years old; Senior, over 7 years old.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a,b</sup>Means with different superscript letters within a row are different (p < 0.05).

x,yMeans with different superscript letters within a row are different (p < 0.10).